UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,103	09/15/2006	Yukihiko Mashima	Q96480	9096
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 03/24/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			SHAW, AMANDA MARIE	
	SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/593,103	MASHIMA, YUKIHIKO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	AMANDA SHAW	1634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	- action is non-final.					
·=	, 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.						
, <u> </u>	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	lection requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer, Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) U Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/593,103 Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

1. Prior to setting forth this restriction requirement it is noted for the record that this application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below: Where the description or claims of a patent application discuss a sequence that is set forth in the "Sequence Listing" reference must be made to the sequence by use of the sequence identifier, preceded by "SEQ ID NO:" in the text of the description or claims even if the sequence is also embedded in the text of the description or claims of the patent application. In the instant case both the claims and the description contains sequences that are not identified by SEQ ID Nos. Due to the large number of sequences present in the claims and the description that are not identified by their SEQ ID NOs it is impossible to determine if all of these sequences have been listed in the paper copy and the CRF copy of the Sequence Listing. Therefore applicants are required to amend the claims and description so that each sequence is identified by its SEQ ID NO: and if any sequence is present that is not listed in the Sequence Listing it must be added to the Sequence Listing and must full comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Page 3

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1, 14-28, drawn to nucleic acids and compositions comprising nucleic acids.

Group 2, claim(s) 2-13, drawn to methods for diagnosing or predicting susceptibility to optic neuropathy related disorders.

Group 3, claim(s) 29-30, drawn to a method for treating glaucoma.

Group 4, claim(s) 31-35, drawn to a method for predicting the response of a subject to treatment with a drug.

3. The inventions listed as Groups 1-4 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons:

A 371 case is considered to have unity of invention only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features. The expression "special technical feature" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. In the instant application, the linking technical feature of SNPs that are associated with optic neuropathy does not constitute a contribution over the prior art. For example, Brown (American Journal of Human

Art Unit: 1634

Genetics 1997) teaches that Leber hereditary optic neuropathy is a type of blindness caused by mtDNA mutations. Three LHON mtDNA mutations at nucleotide positions 3460, 11778, and 14484 are specific for LHON and account for 90% of worldwide cases and are thus designated as primary LHON mtDNA mutations. Thus, there is no special technical feature linking the recited groups, as would be necessary to fulfill the requirement for unity of invention.

4. Groups 1-2 are subject to a further restriction requirement because Groups 1-2 encompass a multitude of distinct genes. Specifically the claims encompass at least 10 distinct genes (i.e. Endothelin-1 gene, mitochondrial gene, tumor necrosis factor a gene, paraoxonase 1 gene) as well as all possible combinations thereof. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that each of the genes share a common property or activity. Moreover, since each gene occurs at a specific nucleotide position and consists of a specific nucleotide sequence they fail to share a common structure. Since neither of these two requirements is met, the group of genes claimed does not meet the requirement of unity of invention. Therefore Applicants must further elect a single gene or a single combination of genes to be examined.

Additionally Groups 1-2 are subject to a further restriction requirement because they encompass a multitude of distinct SNPs. Specifically the claims encompass 48 distinct SNPs as well as all possible combinations thereof. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that each of the SNPs share a common property or activity. Moreover, since each SNP occurs at a specific nucleotide position and consists of a

Application/Control Number: 10/593,103

Art Unit: 1634

specific nucleotide sequence they fail to share a common structure. Since neither of these two requirements is met, the group of SNPs claimed does not meet the requirement of unity of invention. Therefore Applicants must further elect a single SNP or a single combination of SNPs within the elected gene(s) to be examined.

Page 5

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during

prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejections are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,103

Art Unit: 1634

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Page 7

- 7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMANDA SHAW whose telephone number is (571)272-8668. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00 TO 6:30.

 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached at 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/593,103 Page 8

Art Unit: 1634

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda M. Shaw Examiner Art Unit 1634

/Carla Myers/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634